

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20, 26-30 and 34-47 are pending; and Claim 10 is amended by the present amendment. Changes to Claim 10 address minor informalities. Thus, the changes to the claims add no new matter and present issues previously considered by the Examiner. Accordingly, the changes to the claim require no further search or consideration.

The outstanding official action rejected Claims 1, 10, 34, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0167315 to *Chowdhry, et al.* (hereinafter “*Chowdhry*”) and in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165752 to *Miller* (hereinafter “*Miller*”). It also rejected Claims 2-9, 11-20, 26-30, 35, 37, 39-41, 43, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Chowdhry*, and *Miller*, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023230 to *Bolnick*.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the grant of an interview between the Applicants’ representatives and the Examiner on October 13, 2009 and follow up discussion on December 4, 2009. In accordance with MPEP § 713.04, Applicants’ representatives discussed the differences between Applicants’ independent Claim 1 and Fig. 36 of *Chowdhry* and Fig. 15 of *Miller*. Particularly, Applicants’ representatives presented arguments that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said customized version of said electronic information product” and “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is not said specific type of user, said electronic information product formatted in said default display format,” as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner considered these arguments persuasive, but indicated that he may conduct an additional search. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that, in the event the Examiner does not find the application in its current state allowable (for any reason), the Examiner contact the undersigned to attempt to arrive at an agreement on allowance and expedite prosecution prior to issuing another official action that rejected the claims. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to an Internet delivery method delivering electronic information products to a plurality of users. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said customized version of said electronic information product.” Claim 1 further recites “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is not said specific type of user, said electronic information product formatted in said default display format.”

Regarding the applied references, *Chowdhry* describes a system for generating websites using portlets.¹ Fig. 36 illustrates an example user page for users who belong to a user group. *Chowdhry* describes this user page as “a multi-page portal interface ... where the interface has a number of tabs ... and displays a single page at a time.”² *Chowdhry* describes that a user logs into the system to access the user page of *Chowdhry*, but if the user “does not belong to a user group, ... [the user is] a member of ... [a] default group [called] ‘guest.’”³ *Chowdhry* further describes that these “guest group members are ... **unable to do anything** and after logging in **simply receive a message** that they are part of the guest group and must see their administrator.”⁴

However, *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest that members who belong to a group of *Chowdhry* receive a customized version of the **message**. That is, there is no information product in *Chowdhry* that is delivered to members of a group as a customized version and delivered to non-members where the information product is formatted in a default display format. Accordingly, *Chowdhry* fails to disclose or suggest “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said customized version of said electronic information product” and “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is not said specific type of user, said electronic information product formatted in said default display format.”

Miller describes a system for matching applicants to job openings, where applicants fill out applications stored on the system of *Miller*.⁵ When searching for an application on the system, *Miller* describes that an “employer may input an application identification number to

¹ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 6.

² See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 260. As described in paragraph 112 of *Chowdhry*, user pages created by the system in *Chowdhry* include the WERCLETS™.

³ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 257.

⁴ See *Chowdhry* at Paragraph 257. (Emphasis added).

⁵ See *Miller* at Paragraphs 6 and 48.

find a specific application.”⁶ *Miller* further describes that if “a nonmember accesses this search, the Become a Member fee descriptions are preferably shown on the page with a continue button to link to the next page ... [, where] the non-member preferably goes to the page which will list the application and the payment requirement to get the application, or become a member.”⁷

However, *Miller* fails to disclose or suggest any application that may be delivered both to a member user as a customized version and to a non-member where the application is formatted in a default display format. Particularly, an application in *Miller* is provided in the same format to members and non-members, where the non-members must pay an additional fee or become a member to access the application. Accordingly, *Miller* fails to disclose or suggest “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is said specific type of user, said customized version of said electronic information product” and “delivering, upon determination that the authenticated user is not said specific type of user, said electronic information product formatted in said default display format,” as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, *Chowdhry* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 10 recites features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, *Chowdhry* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 10. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 10, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 34 recites features analogous to Claim 1. Accordingly, *Chowdhry* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 34. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 34, and claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 2-9, 11-20, 26-30, 35, 37, 39-41, 43 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Chowdhry*, and *Miller*, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0023230 to *Bolnick*.

As discussed above, *Chowdhry* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claims 1, 10, and 34, from which Claims 2-9, 11-19, 35, 37, 39, and 43 depend. Additionally,

⁶ See *Miller* at Paragraph 62.

⁷ See *Miller* at Paragraph 62.

since Claim 1 recites features analogous to Claim 20, *Chowdhry* and *Miller* fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 20. Applicants have considered *Bolnick* and submit that this applied reference fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chowdhry* and *Miller*. Accordingly, Applicants submit that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 2-9, 11-20, 26-30, 35, 37, 39-41, 43, and 46. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Consequently, in view of the present response and amendments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in a condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Request for a Telephone Interview

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-607-3500.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: /Soumya Panda/
Soumya (Soum) P. Panda
Reg. No. 60,447
303.607.3731
Customer No.: 35657

Dated: December 7, 2009

fb.us.4491538.02